

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 20 are now pending in this application, claims 12-19 having been canceled previously, and claims 21-23 having been canceled herein. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim.

The rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is now moot since claims 21-23 have been canceled.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-11 and 20 are rejected under 103(a) as being anticipated by Doshi et al. (US 6,130,875, “Doshi”) in view of Henderson et al. (US 6,058,103, “Henderson”).

These rejections are hereby traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner asserts in the Final Action that Henderson shows the claimed step of determining the impact of the cabling changes on service through the network, including impacts on cross-connects and lightpaths. As support for this assertion the Examiner points to column 7, lines 53-56 of Henderson, which states:

The nsGeoLink class 212 and the nsGeoNode class 214 handle graphical rendering of communications links and communications equipments for presentation on, for example, a geographical map.

Thus, Henderson simply discusses communications links. The Examiner further asserts on page 7 of the Final Action, however, that “Henderson teaches determining the connectivity of paths between endpoints in a network. Since the network uses optical media the paths are correctly construed as lightpaths.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, not all paths through optical media are a lightpath. Rather, it is well known that a lightpath refers to a point to point connection with an effective guaranteed bandwidth (see, for example, Bill St. Arnaud, “User controlled Lightpaths Definition Document”, copy enclosed and available at http://www.canarie.ca/canet4/library/c4design/user_controlled_definition.ppt). A lightpath can be realized by allocating a wavelength on each link on the path between the two nodes. The wavelengths used on the various links may be the same or different.

However, the same wavelength cannot be assigned to two different lightpaths on the same link. (see, e.g., R. Ramaswami et al. Optical Networks: A Practical Perspective, Academic Press, London, 1998, page 333), copy enclosed.

Thus, a lightpath may be construed as a very particular type of communication link. However, simply because Henderson refers broadly to the rendition of communication links over an optical medium does not mean that Henderson discloses the more particular step of rendering of lightpaths, let alone the determination of the impact caused by cable changes on lightpaths. In fact, Henderson does not even specifically discuss lightpaths. Accordingly, since claim 1 requires determining the impact of cabling changes on cross-connects and lightpaths and because neither Doshi, Henderson nor any of the remaining references cited by the Examiner show or suggest such a feature, claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are believed to be patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, for all of the reasons presented above the rejection of independent claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner believes there are still unresolved issues, a telephone call to the undersigned would be welcomed.

FEES

Any fees that may be due and owing as a result of this Amendment may be charged to the undersigned attorney's PTO Deposit Account No. 50-1047.

Dated: 10/7/2009

Attorney for Applicants
Mayer & Williams PC
251 North Avenue West, 2nd Floor
Westfield, NJ 07090
908-518-7700 Tel.
908-518-7795 Fax

Respectfully submitted,

By /Stuart H. Mayer/

Stuart H. Mayer
Registration No.: 35,277